APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,550	12/11/2003	Oded Grinberg	017900-004110US	2429

59734   7590   05/04/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
PATEL, DHAIRYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	Application No. 10/734,550	Applicant(s) GRINBERG, ODED	
	Examiner Dhairya A. Patel	Art Unit 2151	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>22 March 2007</u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u>.
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u>.
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-28</u>.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u>.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
<u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per remarks, applicant stated the following:
A). Applicant states Basin fails to teach "extracting content from the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files in the content package file with the content extracted from the first level content files to create a combined file"
B). Applicant states Basin fails to teach "removing the references from the combined file"
C). Applicant states Krause fails to teach "preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the second package file "
D). Applicant states Basin, Krause fails to teach "at least extracting content from first level content files referred to in a content package, extracting content from one or more lower level content files referenced to the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files and the one or more lower level content files with at least some of the extracted content to generate a combined content file representing a modified version of the content package file, removing the references from the combined content file and previewing the modified version of the content package file".
As per remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in Fig. 9, Paragraph 39, Paragraph 37 lines 4-16, Basin teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files, which are extracted when the user selects PKZIP|extract here (content extracted from first level content files)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16). Applicant states Basin does not teach combined file. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in Fig. 9, Basin teaches creating a zip file i.e. combined file with the content from the first level content files which are extracted. Therefore Basin teaches the claimed limitations.
As per remark B, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in Paragraph 10 and Paragraph 12, Basin teaches before saving the changes, archives i.e. the combined file are modified, and the edit before saving provides deleting i.e. removing from the archive the overhead for compressing the archives therefore minimizing the overhead i.e. removing reference from the combined file. Therefore Basin teaches the claimed limitations.
As per remark C, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 3 lines 7-15,22-28, Krause teaches if the operator wants to preview content, it can be previewed on the fly for the metadata for the file (first level content files) and then in the preview window, one can view the icon for the first file and the second file once the file is extracted (previewing content from the second package file) which is the whole file. Therefore Krause teaches the claimed limitations. Basin fails to teach these limitations, but Krause teaches them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Krause's invention in Basin's invention to come up with previewing the some of the content of the first level content files and content from the second package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to offer automatic and almost instantaneous method for previewing the contents of a file without having to a launch an application (column 4 lines 25-29).
As per remark D, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in Paragraph 37, Basin teaches retrieving from the zip file (content package file) number of files (first level content files)(Fig. 4)(Fig. 9). In figure 9 it teaches extracted files for example "pkzip25.exe" (first level content file). In Fig. 9, Paragraph 39, Paragraph 37 lines 4-16, Basin teaches extracting content from one or more lower level content files referenced to the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files and the one or more lower level content files (user selecting PKZIP| extract here) with at least some of the extracted content to generate a combined content file (creating a zip file) representing a modified version of the content package file. Basin further teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files, which are extracted when the user selects PKZIP|extract here (content extracted from first level content files)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16). In Paragraph 10, Paragraph 12, Basin teaches removing (deleteing the archinve the overhead for compressing the archives before minimizing the overhead) the reference from the combined file (archive file). Basin fails to teach previewing the modified version of the content package file to determine if there are issues associated with generating a modified content package file using the combined file content. Laverty teaches previewing the modified version of the content package file to determine if there are issues associated with generating a modified content package file using the combined file content (Fig. 7)(Fig. 16)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 14 lines 25-28)(column 22 lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Laverty's teaching in Basin's teaching to come up with previewing a modified version of the content package to determine issues associated with generating a modified content package file. The motivation for doing so would been so check whether if there are any errors or the preview looks like the way the user desired therefore any changes can be made before merging the files. Examiner would like to point out that Examiner never stated Krause teaches previewing the modified version of the content package file to claim 25. Laverty teaches that limitations. Examiner would also like to point out that in the argument, applicant stated "at least extracting content files from the first level content files..." Examiner would like to point out that claim language does not include "at least". It states "extracting content from first level content files referred to in a content package".